



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,309	03/23/2000	Yoshinori Ohta	4-165US-FF	9768

21254 7590 05/02/2005

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/534,309

Applicant(s)

OHTA ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua D Campbell

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination filed on 07/08/2004.
2. Claims 1-19 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 6, and 19 are independent claims. Claims 1-6 have been amended. Claims 7-19 have been added.
3. The rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. in view of Yang et al. has been withdrawn in view of amendments.
4. The rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. in view of Yang et al. further in view of Rowe et al. has been withdrawn in view of amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 1-10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. (US Patent Number 5,781,773, issued on July 14, 1998) in view of Sheffield (US Patent Number 5,832,481, issued on November 3, 1998).

Regarding independent claims 1, 6, and 19, Vanderpool et al. discloses a system that displays searched items in a database (column 3, lines 21-24 of Vanderpool et al.). Vanderpool et al. discloses two tables contained within a database, one of these

tables contains the full data items and user inputs including terms of search for the data items, while the other table contains parts of the full data items that are to be displayed, also field names are displayed and listed as a part of the table (Figure 5 and column 6, lines 34-44 of Vanderpool et al.). This database is accessed by using a computer implemented searching system which shows the results on a display apparatus (column 3, lines 21-24 of Vanderpool et al.). This system has the ability to access the databases and thus can be thought of as a read-out device for all elements and tables contained within the database.

Vanderpool et al. does not disclose a system in which the relational database uses three tables for the search and display system. However, the table driven database disclosed by Vanderpool et al. has the same functionality as the applicants' invention. There is no functional difference between one table that contains two delineated data types and two tables that contain only one type each. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used three tables in the database for the display system of Vanderpool et al. because the table disclosed by Vanderpool et al. which contains the full data items and the user inputs acts as a double-table.

Vanderpool et al. also does not disclose a method in which the user may order the data in the tables or the ability to add and modify items in the data tables of the database. However, Sheffield discloses a method of editing items in tables of a database. Editing abilities include adding, modifying, deleting, and sorting (order) items contained within the tables of a relational database (column 22, line 60-column 23 line

9 of Sheffield). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would to have used the method of Sheffield applied into the system of Vanderpool et al. because it would have provided an easy to use, efficient interface between the user and the database itself.

Regarding dependent claim 2-5, all of these claims of the applicant's disclosure entail nothing more than the ability to edit data and add data into a table in a relational database. Vanderpool et al. also does not disclose a method in which the user may order the data in the tables or the ability to add and modify items in the data tables of the database. However, Sheffield discloses a method of editing items in tables of a database. Editing abilities include adding, modifying, deleting, and sorting (order) items contained within the tables of a relational database (column 22, line 60-column 23 line 9 of Sheffield). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would to have used the method of Sheffield applied into the system of Vanderpool et al. because it would have provided an easy to use, efficient interface between the user and the database itself.

Regarding dependent claims 7-10, all of these claims of the applicant's disclosure entail nothing more than the ability to edit data and add data into a table in a relational database. Vanderpool et al. also does not disclose a method in which the user may order the data in the tables or the ability to add and modify items in the data tables of the database. However, Sheffield discloses a method of editing items in tables of a database. Editing abilities include adding, modifying, deleting, and sorting (order) items contained within the tables of a relational database (column 22, line 60-column

Art Unit: 2179

23 line 9 of Sheffield). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would to have used the method of Sheffield applied into the system of Vanderpool et al. because it would have provided an easy to use, efficient interface between the user and the database itself.

7. Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. (US Patent Number 5,781,773, issued on July 14, 1998) in view of Sheffield (US Patent Number 5,832,481, issued on November 3, 1998) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Blinn et al. (hereinafter Blinn, US Patent Number 5,897,622, issued on April 27, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 11-18, Vanderpool et al. discloses a method in which a database system that is implemented via software comprises a database controller which controls the operation and searches of said database system (Figure 5, column 3, lines 21-24, and column 6, lines 34-44 of Vanderpool et al.). Neither Vanderpool et al. nor Sheffield disclose a method in which the database system contains a storage unit for storing data representing a template, is searched via client communication to the internet, and has a search page generating unit for generating an HTML page data for a search page which represents the search results and accepts input for search criteria all of which is provide by a web server.

However, Blinn discloses a method in which a web server generates HTML search pages based on HTML templates stored in a storage unit linked to a database which may be used to search by a client using an internet connection, at which point

results will be provided by a page that is generated containing the search results based on HTML templates (Figure 12, column 1, lines 42-67, and column 17, lines 18-41 of Blinn). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Vanderpool et al. and Sheffield with the methods of Blinn because it would have allowed information in the database to be provided to a global audience.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2179

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC
April 19, 2005


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100